

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 007412.00091											
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____ Signature _____ Typed or printed name _____	Application Number 10/074,743	Filed 02/12/2002											
	First Named Inventor Scott Brenner												
	Art Unit 2424	Examiner Annan Q. Shang											
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <table border="0"><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.</td><td>/Christopher M. Swickhamer/</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</td><td>Signature Christopher M. Swickhamer</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 59853</td><td>Typed or printed name 312.463.5000</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</td><td>Telephone number June 30, 2011</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Date</td></tr></table> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below".</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.</p>				<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.	/Christopher M. Swickhamer/	<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Signature Christopher M. Swickhamer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 59853	Typed or printed name 312.463.5000	<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____	Telephone number June 30, 2011		Date
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.	/Christopher M. Swickhamer/												
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Signature Christopher M. Swickhamer												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 59853	Typed or printed name 312.463.5000												
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____	Telephone number June 30, 2011												
	Date												

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Attorney Docket No. 007412.00091)

In re U.S. Patent Application of Scott Brenner et al.)	
)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2424
Application No. 10/074,743)	
)	Examiner: Shang, Annan Q.
Filed: February 12, 2002)	
)	Confirmation No. 1522
For: System and Method for Providing Video Program Information or Video Program Content to a User)	

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The review is requested for the reasons stated in the below remarks. Please charge any fees and credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

The following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed March 30, 2011 ("Action"). Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 73-92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeo (US 6,711,741) in view of Lawler et al. (US 6,868,551). Applicants respectfully traverse.

A. Comments on Claim 73 and its Dependent Claims

Claim 73 is drawn to a method comprising:

“receiving, at a terminal, a request to tune to a program being transmitted by a provider, wherein the request is received after a start time of program transmission;

determining, by the terminal, that a user terminal has remained tuned to the program for a predetermined threshold amount of time;

generating and communicating a request to the provider to retrieve a copy of a portion of the program in response to the request to tune to the program and said determining; and

receiving the copy of the portion of the program, wherein the portion comprises the program transmitted.”

The rejection of claim 73 is deficient for at least the following two reasons.

First, both Yeo and Lawler do not disclose the features recited in the determining paragraph of claim 73. In the rejection, the Action concedes that Yeo “does not clearly teach determining that a user terminal has remained tuned to the program for a predetermined threshold amount of time.” *See* Action, p. 4-5. The Action then alleges that Lawler remedies this deficiency. *Id.* at p. 5. Particularly, the Action asserts that “Lawler discloses an interactive program summary panel, which monitors a user interaction as to the various channels and after a predetermined period retrieves summary (text, video, etc.) of the video program to the user.” *Id.*

Notably, the citations to Lawler do not support the Action’s interpretation. Lawler does not disclose monitoring how long a user terminal has remained tuned to a program, and particularly fails to disclose determining whether a user terminal has remained tuned to a program for a predetermined threshold amount of time. Instead, Lawler describes a system including a central control node 12 that transmits programming over a network 14 to multiple viewer stations 16. *See* Lawler, C3, L62-65. Each viewer station 16 is associated with an interactive station controller 20, which Lawler also refers to as a set top box. *Id.* at C4, L3-7. Lawler further indicates providing a programming guide 82 of a display 18 of the viewer station 16 to provide a viewer with information about available programming. *Id.* at C5, L14-25. Lawler describes a viewer selecting on a program tile in the programming guide, and the controller 20 “accesses summary information about the programming focused upon” by the viewer. *Id.* at C6, L11-16.

Of import is that Lawler does not indicate monitoring how long the controller 20 remains tuned to a program, and particularly does not indicate determining whether controller 20 has remained tuned to a program for a predetermined threshold amount of time. The only mention of a time period in the citations is found in lines 20-39 of column 6. At these lines, Lawler merely indicates that “controller 20 periodically (e.g., daily or weekly) receives from EPG database 102 summary text descriptions and related icon bitmaps for a predetermined time period and stores them in memory system 68.” Lawler then indicates that the “controller 20 can retrieve from EPG database 102 the summary text descriptions and related bitmaps of icons that are not available in local memory 68 for the program tile 88 selected or focused upon by the viewer”

which may occur when a viewer selects “a program tile 88 outside the predetermined time period for which the information is stored in memory 68.” In other words, the controller 20 only stores summary text descriptions for programing broadcast during a certain time period (e.g., Monday through Wednesday), and if the viewer wants to view a summary text description of a program being broadcast in a different time period (e.g., Thursday), the controller 20 has to retrieve that summary text description from the EPG database 102. At these cited lines, however, Lawler does not disclose or suggest determining whether controller 20 has remained tuned to a program for a predetermined threshold amount of time, and hence does not disclose performing a method analogous to claim 73. Therefore, contrary to the rejection, the citations to Lawler provided in the Action do not disclose the claim features of “determining, by the terminal, that a user terminal has remained tuned to the program for a predetermined threshold amount of time.” Thus, Yeo and Lawler do not disclose the features recited in the determining paragraph of claim 73.

Second, Yeo does not disclose generating a request in response to the claimed determining paragraph of claim 73. As noted above, the Action concedes that Yeo fails to disclose the claimed determining. *See* Action, p. 4-5. Because Yeo does not disclose the claimed determining, it logically follows that Yeo cannot generate “a request to the provider to retrieve a copy of a portion of the program in response to the request to tune to the program and said determining,” as recited in claim 73. Emphasis added.

The Action, however, incorrectly reaches the opposite conclusion. To support the rejection of the claimed generating of a request, the Action cites to columns 3 and 6 of Yeo. *See* Action, p. 4. In the cited column 3, Yeo describes a temporal snap generator (TSG) 300 that receives video source frames 106 and generates “shots” as well as “temporal snap shots.” *Id.* at C3, L18-32. Yeo defines a “shot” as “a sequence of images captured between a ‘record’ and ‘stop’ camera operation, or in other words, a segment of video source frames 106.” *Id.* Yeo indicates that a “temporal snapshot . . . marks the beginning of a shot.” Notably, these cited lines fail to discuss generating a request in response to “determining . . . that a user terminal has remained tuned to the program for a predetermined threshold amount of time.”

The cited lines in column 6 of Yeo are similarly deficient. In column 6, Yeo indicates that a Random Access Playback System (RAPS) supports multiple networking schemes. *See* Yeo, C6, L32-58. One example is a “multicast/unicast networking mechanism,” where a “server

100 sends a single copy of information over the entire network to multiple desired clients such as client 102.” *Id.* Yeo indicates that “when one of the recipients of server 100's multimedia stream, like client 102, decides to review information which has already been presented, client 102 initiates the previously described requests by selecting one of the temporal snapshot images to server 100.” *Id.* Such an operation “requires server 100 to extract temporal snapshots on the fly for live video as the video is being multicasted” and for “stored video, the temporal snapshots can be computed before the multicast session.” *Id.* Thus, these cited lines merely discuss that a client 102 can request information from a multimedia stream that has already been presented by selecting a temporal snapshot image.

Notably, these cited lines of Yeo do not indicate that Yeo's request is generated *in response to* determining that the client 102 has remained tuned to the multimedia stream for a predetermined threshold amount of time. In fact, the cited lines of Yeo do not even suggest monitoring how long the client 102 has been tuned to a multimedia stream. As such, the Action's interpretation of Yeo is not supported by the teachings of Yeo, and moreover the teachings of Yeo are not analogous to the features recited in the claimed method. Therefore, Yeo does not disclose “generating and communicating a request to the provider to retrieve a copy of a portion of the program in response to the request to tune to the program and said determining,” contrary to the assertions made in the Action. Lawler also does not disclose the claimed generating at least for the reasons provided above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 73 is improper as Yeo and Lawler, alone or in combination, do not disclose all of the elements recited in claim 73. As such, the Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Applicants further solicit notification that claim 73 is allowable.

Independent claims 80, 87, and 90 are allowable at least for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 73. The remaining claims respectively depend from claims 73, 80, 87, and 90, and hence are allowable at least due to dependence on an allowable claim.

B. Comments on Claim 79 and 86

Claim 79 depends from claim 73 via claim 77 and further recites “determining that the user terminal has maintained the channel selection for a predefined period of time before causing presentation of the synopsis.” Claim 77 recites that a synopsis of a program “summarizes the

portion of the program that has been transmitted from a beginning of program transmission until the identified clock time.” In the rejection, the Action alleges that columns 5 and 6 of Yeo disclose the features recited in claim 79. *See* Action, p. 6. In column 5, Yeo describes a buffering scheme for a client to provide smooth video playback and, in column 6, Yeo describes a hierarchical method of viewing video clips.

Absent from the cited lines of Yeo is any disclosure of monitoring of how long the client maintained a channel selection, or requiring the client to maintain a channel selection for a predefined period of time before causing presentation of a synopsis summarizing a previously transmitted portion of a program. The Action’s citations to smooth video playback and a hierarchical method of viewing video clips from Yeo are not analogous to the claim elements for apparent reasons. Also, the Action does not assert or even point to any section of Lawler as disclosing the features of claim 79. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 79 is distinguishable from the Yeo/Lawler combination and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants solicit a notice indicating that claim 79 is allowable.

Claim 86 is allowable for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 79.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: June 30, 2011

By: Christopher M. Swickhamer
Christopher M. Swickhamer
Registration No. 59,853
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001